



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,887	11/16/2001	Ryuta Tanaka	1075.1181	7579

21171 7590 08/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAMQUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,887

Applicant(s)

TANAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Camquy Truong

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19,21,23,25,27,29,31,33,35 and 37-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9,11,15,17,21,23,27,29,33,35 and 37-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13,19,25 and 31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37-46 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

- i. said last-named one processor – claim 3.
- li the last-name one processor – claim 7.

B. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. As to claim 3, it is not clearly indicated whether “said last-named one processor element” refers to “one processor element”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 37-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita (U.S. Patent 7,024,671 B2) in view of Song et al. (U.S. Patent 6,061,711).

5. As to claim 1, Yamashita teaches the invention substantially as claimed including:

two or more processor elements whose performances are to be executed by a common program (the job migration process indicates a process for moving a job being executed by one Processor Element to different Processor Element, col. 2, lines 57-59);

a storing section, responsive to each switching of said processor elements by said control section, for storing handover information relating to the common program which information is to be handed over from said one processor element to said another processor element (col. 4, lines 42-46; col. 5, lines 7-15; col. 7, lines 30-32; col. 8, lines 40-45; col. 14, lines 15-18);

a store control section for storing said handover information from said one processor elements into said storing section when said switching request signal detecting section detects the switching request signal (col. 4, lines 42-46; col. 5, lines 7-15; col. 7, lines 30-32; col. 8, lines 38-45);

a stop control section for stopping the performance of said one processor element after said store control sections stores said handover information into said storing section (col. 8, lines 12-45; col. 12, lines 52-58); and

Art Unit: 2195

a start control section for starting the performance of said another processor element using said handover information stores in said storing section (col. 5, lines 9-15; col. 8, lines 24-29 and lines 41-45).

6. Yamashita does not explicitly teach that a switching signal detecting section for detecting a switching signal to request switching such plural processor elements one from another. However, Song teaches a switching signal detecting section for detecting a switching signal to request switching such plural processor elements one from another (col. 2, lines 52-60).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamashita and Song because Song's switching signal detecting section for detecting a switching signal to request switching such plural processor elements one from another would improve the use efficiency of computer resource.

8. As to claim 3, Song teaches if a performance requested to be executed for one of said plural processor elements is to be made by another processor element, said last-named one processor element outputs said switching request signal to (col. 15, lines 43-44).

Art Unit: 2195

9. As to claim 5, Song teaches switching request signal is a switching control interruption signal (col. 6, lines 24-35).

10. As to claims 7, 9 and 11, Song teaches upon receipt of a signal from outside said system, said control section outputs an interruption signal to the last-one named another processor element to stop the performance thereof (col. 6, lines 24-35).

11. As to claims 37-38 and 40-41, Song teaches at least one of plural processor elements is an MPU and the remainder is a DSP, or vice versa (Fig. 2).

12. As to claim 39, it is rejected for the same reason as claims 7, 9, and 11.

13. As to claim 42, Song teaches invalidating section for invalidating the switching function of said control section to thereby actuate at least two or more of said plural processor elements simultaneously (col.11, lines 6-14).

14. As to claim 43, Song teaches handover information to be stored in said storing section includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a value of a program counter, an argument of a function, a return value of a function, and content of a stack pointer (col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 8).

15. As to claims 44-46, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 13, 19, 25, 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17. Claims 15, 9, 21, 23, 27, 29, 33, 35, would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM – 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2195

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Camquy Truong

August 10, 2006


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100